

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/488,448 | 01/20/00 | ODOTORI | Y SCEI 16,907 |

██████████
Helfgott & Karas PC
Empire State Building
60th floor
New York NY 10118-0110
MMC1/0904

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| EXAMINER | |
| CUEVAS, P | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |

2834
DATE MAILED: 09/04/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/488,448 | OOTORI, YASUHIRO |
| | Examiner Pedro J. Cuevas | Art Unit 2834 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 11-013494, filed on JAPAN. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because Figures 1, 2 and 3 must be labeled "PRIOR ART". Correction is required.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the following labels as described in the specification.

- 32 on Figure 5
- 65 on Figure 6
- ST12 on Figure 10

Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Correction is required.

Specification

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

5. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1 to 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “the/said input operation unit”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation “the game machine”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,004,134 to Marcus et al.

Marcus et al. clearly teaches the construction of a control unit (10) that includes electric motors (30, 32). Both motors are shown with a housing (container), which inherently accommodate a magnetic substance (rotor or stator), a rotation member and a magnetic field generation means to generate a magnetic field inside the container.

With regards to claim 9, Marcus et al. discloses the claimed invention in which the magnetic field generation means is located inside electric motors (30, 32), as shown in Figures 5 and 6. It is inherent that the motors include an electromagnet.

With regards to claim 12, Marcus et al. discloses a magnetic member, which rotate based on an input operation of a input operation unit (10) as shown in Figures 3 & 5, and a magnetic field generation means, which generate a magnetic field toward the magnetic member according to game information.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-4, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,004,134 to Marcus et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,565,108 to Makita.

Marcus et al. clearly teaches the construction of a control unit (10) that includes electric motors (30, 32). Both motors are shown with a housing (container), which inherently accommodate a magnetic substance, a rotation member and a magnetic field generation means to generate a magnetic field inside the container.

Makita teaches the construction of a magnetic powder clutch as shown in Figure 1., with an electro-magnetic powder clutch (1) in which a rotation member (9) is arranged in a state in which part of a peripheral edge is immersed in the magnetic substance, which can be a magnetic

Art Unit: 2834

a magnetic powder (as claimed in claim 7), when there is no magnetic field for the purpose of gradually engaging the drive plate (5) to the system (2). Makita also discloses a rotation member (9), which is arranged in a state in which all of one side is immersed in the magnetic substance, when there is no magnetic field for the purpose of gradually engaging the drive plate (5) to the system (2). Makita also discloses a rotation member (9), which has an accommodation part (10) to accommodate the magnetic substance, when a magnetic field is produced for the purpose of gradually engaging the drive plate (5) to the system (2). Makita also discloses a container (11) with a space isolated from rotation member (9), to collect the magnetic substance when a magnetic field is generated for the purpose of gradually de-engage the drive plate (5) to the system (2).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the electro-magnetic powder clutch (1) disclosed by Makita on the resistance force generator disclosed by Marcus et al. for the purpose of magnetically coupling the magnetic substance (stator) with the rotation member (38, 40) and gradually engaging or de-engaging the drive plate (5) to the system (2).

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,004,134 to Marcus et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,611,697 to Okita et al.

Marcus et al. clearly teaches the construction of a control unit (10) that includes electric motors (30, 32). Both motors are shown with a housing (container), which inherently accommodate a magnetic substance, a rotation member and a magnetic field generation means to

Art Unit: 2834

generate a magnetic field inside the container. However it fails to disclose a rotation member made of a nonmagnetic substance.

Okita et al. teaches the construction of an electromagnetic coupling in which the output shaft (14) has mounted on the end within the space in the first rotary member (2) a pair of rim elements (20, 22) of a magnetic material. These rim elements and output shaft (14) constitute a rotary member (4), which inherently is of a nonmagnetic substance, for the purpose of forming an annular cavity between the rim elements (20, 22) and rotary member (4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rotary member disclosed by Okita et al. on the resistance force generator disclosed by Marcus et al. for the purpose of forming an annular nonmagnetic cavity between the rim elements (20, 22) and rotary member (4).

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,004,134 to Marcus et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,628,267 to Hoshio et al.

Marcus et al. clearly teaches the construction of a control unit (10) that includes electric motors (30, 32). Both motors are shown with a housing (container), which inherently accommodate a magnetic substance, a rotation member and a magnetic field generation means to generate a magnetic field inside the container. However it fails to disclose a rotation member (38, 40), which includes rotating vanes (11, 42 and 51) for the purpose of balancing the rotational speed of the spin shaft (12a), by the losses caused by it's resistance to rotation.

Art Unit: 2834

Hoshio et al. teaches the construction of a oscillation suppression device with a rotation member (12a) which includes rotating vanes (11, 42 and 51) for the purpose of balancing the rotational speed of the spin shaft (12a), by the losses caused by it's resistance to rotation.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rotation member (12a) which includes rotating vanes (11, 42 and 51) disclosed by Hoshio et al. on the resistance force generator disclosed by Marcus et al. for the purpose of balancing the rotational speed of the spin shaft (12a).

14. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,004,134 to Marcus et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,305,055 to C.S. Slaughter.

Marcus et al. discloses the construction of a control unit (10) that includes electric motors (30, 32). Both motors are shown with a housing (container), which inherently accommodate a magnetic substance, a rotation member and a magnetic field generation means to generate a magnetic field inside the container. However it fails to disclose a control unit containing a magnetic fluid as the substance, as stated in claim 8, and a rotation member that collects a magnetic substance on an entire region when a magnetic field is generated, as stated in claim 10.

C.S. Slaughter teaches the construction of a fluid particle coupling, which has a thin low inertia disc (11) positioned to rotate in a container (13) filled loosely with a fluid powder (14) for the purpose of acting as a low viscosity cloud during rotation of the disc (11).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use fluid particle coupling disclosed by C.S. Slaughter on the resistance force generator disclosed by Marcus et al. for the purpose of acting as a low viscosity cloud during rotation of the disc (11).

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: see form PTO-892
16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro J. Cuevas whose telephone number is (703) 308-4904. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T from 8:00 - 5:30; F from 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Néstor R. Ramírez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-1341 for regular communications and (703) 305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

pjc
August 24, 2001



Nicholas Ponomarenko
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800